

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 358-367, 369, and 371 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 358-372 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 358-367, 369, and 371 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least at page 53, lines 1 to 13, and at page 54, line 9 to page 55, line 15 of the specification.

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because it (a) places the application in *prima facie* condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration by the Examiner because similar subject matter was previously considered by the Examiner and thus further consideration and/or search by the Examiner is not warranted; and (c) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. For at least these reasons, entry of the present Amendment is therefore respectfully requested. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 358-372 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,634, issued to Korpela ("Korpela") in view of 3GPP TS 25.331, V3.0.0 (1999-10) ("Specification").

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c)

resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should "identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, slip op. at 14-15 (2007). Thus, even if the prior art may be combined, the references when combined must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. See *in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Korpela and the Specification, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest every feature of the claimed invention. For example, claim 358 as amended recites, *inter alia*:

a message comprising an information element identifying
an operating type of a core network,
wherein the operating type of the core network comprises
global system for mobile communications application part (GSM-
MAP). (emphasis added)

Korpela fails to disclose at least these features. Referring to Fig. 8 and col. 6, lines 15-25 of Korpela, a signal transmitted from the radio access network includes a country identification portion 101, a network identifying portion 103, and a backbone network type code 102. The backbone network type code 102 indicates, at most, "whether the network is, for example, a GSM network, a B-ISDN network, and so on," which is distinct from a core network operating type such as GSM-MAP or ANSI-41. Korpela, col. 6, lines 24-25. Thus, Korpela's signal including a backbone network type code 102 fails to disclose:

a message comprising an information element identifying
an operating type of a core network,
wherein the operating type of the core network comprises
global system for mobile communications application part (GSM-
MAP). (emphasis added)

Accordingly, Korpela fails to disclose at least these features of claim 358. For at least the reasons asserted above with respect to claim 358, Korpela fails to disclose every limitation

of claims 359-367, 369, and 371 as amended. Further, the Specification fails to remedy the shortcomings of Korpela with respect to these claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 358-367, 369, and 371. Claims 368, 370, and 372 depend from claims 367, 369, and 371, respectively, and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 358-367, 369, and 371, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 21, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/kbs